

We stand on the brink of a conflagration in the Middle East, spreading from Iraq to Iran, to Pakistan and Afghanistan and the entire region. The legacy of this administration could be wars without ends and wars without borders.

Waiting for the next election may be too late; 475 days is a long time.

As a medical doctor, I was trained to listen to the patient. I've been listening to this President, and he's telling us that Iran is his next military target. Congress is all that stands in the way of this President carrying out a bombing strike of how many sources, how many sites we don't know. And I urge the House to act before it is too late.

We need a resolution that requires the President to come back to the Congress before any act of war is taken against Iran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHAYS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE MEASURE OF SUCCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the military announced yesterday that the number of monthly U.S. combat deaths fell to the lowest point in a year. Military and administration officials tout-ed this as a success.

Is this the way we're measuring success in Iraq these days? Sixty-four brave members of our military forces were killed in September. And that is a success? That is something to brag about?

Tell that to the 64 families who will have to celebrate the holidays without their loved ones this year. Tell that to the children who lost a parent. Tell that to the mother who prayed every single day for the safe return of her child.

That is not a success, Mr. Speaker. That is a tragic loss of life. We have lost over 3,800 brave men and women in uniform in the occupation of Iraq. At least 28,000 have been wounded. How many is too many before the administration sees the errors of its ways? I can't begin to guess.

And what about the Iraqi families? Press reports indicate that nearly 1,000 Iraqis were killed during the month of September. Tens of thousands were displaced from their homes in September.

Is this another success of the administration? Tell that to the children who can't go to school, to the hospitals trying to treat patients without a consistent supply of electricity, to the families who just want to live a normal life.

The international community, the so-called coalition of the willing, sees

the writing on the wall. In fact, British Prime Minister Gordon Brown just announced that 1,000 British troops will leave by the end of the year.

And speaking of milestones, Mr. Speaker, the number of coalition partner deaths recently reached 4,000. Enough is enough.

This Congress must, we must take bold steps to bring our troops home and to help the Iraqi people return to their lives. Only when the United States military presence, troops and contractors leave Iraq will the real healing and national rebuilding begin.

We don't need any more reports. What we need is action. We need the Commander in Chief to support the troops. We need him to bring our troops home, not in a year, not in 10, now. And we have seen that this administration will not redeploy the troops unless Congress forces its hand.

Eighty-four Members of the House have sent a letter to the President saying that we will only support spending bills that fully fund the safe, orderly and responsible redeployment of our troops and our military contractors. No more, no less.

Join us in our resolve. Support our troops. Bring them home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

NAFTA EXPANSION TO PERU

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the proposed Bush NAFTA expansion to Peru provides no path to job growth in the United States or to correcting the growing U.S. trade deficit with Peru. The Bush proposal will yield the same result: more outsourced U.S. jobs, growing trade deficits, more landless Peruvian farmers, rising coca production, more illegal immigration, continued decline in the quality of life on both continents, and enrichment for a narrow band of political and multinational elites.

The proposed Peru agreement keeps intact some of the most offensive NAFTA-CAFTA provisions, such as prohibiting Congress from passing legislation to promote "buy American" or to prevent the offshoring of more of our jobs. We keep asking ourselves: If you keep getting the same bad result, why keep enacting more of the same kinds of laws?

The agreement even amplifies the CAFTA provisions regarding foreign investors being able to procure government contracts and settle disputes outside of U.S. courts. I find it unacceptable that the agreement handcuffs this Congress as it attempts to protect the

interests of the people who send us to represent them. That's supposed to be our job.

On a number of fronts, the Peru Free Trade Agreement stands to cause more harm than good. Take worker rights. The agreement merely commits Peru to hortatory, nonbinding language in the preamble to the ILO convention, and it does nothing to assure enforcement through the actual body of the conventions that provide the real protection for workers. There are no worker protections in this draft.

In addition, the environmental provisions are equally inferior. All of the major environmental groups oppose the agreement, but for a couple who receive heavy corporate contributions. Would this have anything to do with the fact that the Andalusian pipeline that will bring more oil and gas out of Latin America might have something to do with this agreement?

Importantly, in agriculture, as Oxfam points out, "the agreement will harm many thousands of Peru's farmers," just as in Mexico millions of farmers have been harmed who then flock to the United States to find any kind of sustenance. Though some American farmers think they will stand to benefit from the zeroed-out tariffs, many don't understand that the MERCOSUR customs agreement between Peru and its neighbors will allow pork to flow in there from Argentinean and Brazilian imports. So I would think that our pork producers should be very skeptical that they're going to claim the largest share of that market.

Now, where are these displaced Peruvian farmers supposed to turn? Perhaps, in their desperation for a profitable crop, they will help Peru reclaim its title as the world's number one coca producer. Or perhaps they will follow the same path as Mexico's abandoned corn and bean farmers and migrate to the overcrowded cities of the United States, legally or not.

President Bush's Peru deal continues the bad trade policies that leave our consumers vulnerable to food safety catastrophes. Peru places second to China in its fisheries, and plenty of Peruvian seafood imports to our country are rejected due to filth, salmonella and equally disturbing criteria. Indeed, 27 percent, a third of all Peruvian antibiotic lines imported to this country already are found to be tainted and rejected. Why would we want more?

Until now, Democrats have stood united against President Bush's plan to privatize Social Security in the United States; yet the proposed Peruvian agreement effectively endorses and solidifies Peru's privileged and privatized and severely flawed system. Giant multinational banks such as Citibank that invest in these private investor accounts would, under the Peru agreement, be entitled to compensation if privatization were reversed.

Despite all of these concerns, instead of holding a formal hearing on such far-reaching legislation for a country